



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,507	07/27/2001	Kim Clohessy	RSW920010069US1	9737

7590 10/21/2004

Stephen J. Weed, Esquire  
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP  
2600 Aramark Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER
----------

TRUONG, CAMQUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/917,507	CLOHESSY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Camquy Truong	2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/27/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:

- i. Said allocated segment – claim 9;

B. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. As to claims 1-25, it is not clearly indicated what are the abbreviation of RDL and CARSRMAX.
- ii As to claims 1, 14 and 20, it is not clearly understood what an associated RDL is; line 7, it is not clearly indicate an associated RDL is refer to a plural or singular; line 8, it is not clearly indicate what the CARSRMAX is and how the CARSRMAX relates to the maximum required runtime resources.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (U.S. Patent 6,282,561 B1) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

6. As to claims 1, 14 and 20, Jones teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: A runtime-resource management-method (col. 1, line 37-38), said method comprising the steps of:

Identifying one or more new application component (col. 1, lines 27-29), each of said one or more new application components having an associated RDL (col.5, lines 65-67);

Determining maximum required runtime resources for said one or more new application components from said associated RDLs (34, Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 14-15 and lines 66-67; col. 7, lines 9-12);

Determining CARSRMAX in device (col. 7, lines 26-69);

Comparing said maximum required runtime resources to said CARSRMAX (col. 8, lines 44-45; col. 11, lines 13-16); and

Prohibiting said one or more new application components from loading (col. 6, lines 15-34; col. 7, lines 30-31) if said CARSRMAX is less than said maximum required runtime resources (col.8, lines 57-58; col. 12, lines 11-13).

7. Jones does not explicitly teach that the system is a portable device. However, AAPA teaches a portable device (page 1, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching the Jones and AAPA because AAPA's portable device would improved resource-management methods, system, and products which protect runtime system resources from poorly designed or destructive application components.

8. As to claims 5, 17 and 23, Jones teaches a runtime-resource management-method (col. 1, lines 37-38), said method comprising the step of:

Reserving maximum runtime resources required for each application component loaded into system (col. 5, lines 11-18; col. 13, lines 31-40).

9. As to claims 2, 15 and 21, Jones teaches said step of determining said CARSRMAX comprises the steps of:

Determining total runtime system resources (col. 9, lines 52-54);

Determining total maximum reserved runtime resources for loaded application components (col. 9, lines 55-58; col. 13, lines 31-40); and

Calculating said CARSRMAX based on said total runtime system resources and said total maximum reserved runtime resources (col. 9, lines 59-61).

10. As to claims 3, 16 and 22, Jones teaches:

Removing one or more of said loaded application components (col. 4, lines 21-22); and

Releasing maximum runtime resources reserved for said one or more loaded application components, thereby increasing said CARSRAMAX (col. 10, lines 40-41).

11. As to claim 4, Jones teaches said CARSRMAX comprises requirements for at least one or more runtime system resources selected from a group consisting of RAM, threads, and sockets (col. 4, lines 36-37; col. 5, lines 33-36; col. 13, lines 55-56).

12. As to claims 6, 18 and 24, Jones teaches running one or more of said loaded application components using no more than said maximum required runtime resources reserved for each of said one or more loaded application components (col. 5, lines 18-20).

13. As to claims 7, 19, 25 Jones teaches opening said one or more loaded application components (col. 5, lines 35-37);

Monitoring requests for runtime resources by each of said one or more loaded application components (col. 5, lines 2-4); and

Comparing runtime resources in use plus runtime resources requested to said maximum required runtime resources reserved for each of said one or more load application components (col. 5, lines 15-17).

14. As to claim 8, Jones teaches allocating a segment of RAM to each of said loaded application components based on RAM requirements in an RDL associated with each of said loaded application component for use by said loaded application component (col. 5, lines 10-14).

15. As to claims 9, 11 and 13, Jones teaches running one or more application components using said allocated segments of RAM (col. 5, lines 55-57);

Monitoring RAM use by said one or more loaded application component (col. 5, lines 4-7);

Preventing each of said one or more loaded application components from using more than said segment of RAM allocated to each of said one or more loaded application component (col. 5, lines 15-18; col. 8, lines 43-45; col. 11, lines 12-14; col. 13, lines 64-67);

16. As to claims 10 and 12, Jones teaches writing thread requirement to a thread table for each of said loaded application component based on thread requirement in an RDL associated with each of said loaded application ( col.6, lines 19-25).

***Conclusion***

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Camquy Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM – 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Camquy Truong

September 27, 2004

  
**MENG-AL T. AN**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100